



Donovan Rafferty
2006 National Air Monitoring
Conference
Las Vegas, Nevada
November 2006

Impact of the Monitoring Rule on Washington State

Positive

- Reduction in CO and O₃ monitoring
- Quality Assurance Revisions

Additional guidance needed

 New PM_{2.5} FRM Network and Approved Regional Methods





- Reduction in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} collocated samples
- Washington will participate in the PEP and NPAP audit programs
- Lower QC and audit concentration range
- o Reduced number of PM_{2.5} audits (2001-140 to 2007-12)



The Quality Assurance Checklist for Washington State

Quality Assurance Changes in the New Monitoring Rule		
1. Consolidation of QA requirements	X	
2. Realignment to current EPA QA policies	X	
3. Similar QC and QA for all PM samplers	X	
4. PEP and NPAP audits with options	X	
5. Revision to precision and bias statistics	X	
6.Program updates	X	





Quality Assurance StrategyWorkgroup

- o Began in 2000 at Workshop in RTP
 - QA Validation Templates
- Input: New Monitoring Strategy and Revisions
 - QA, Technology and Regulatory workgroups
- o Members continue to meet to review progress and set goals for the future
- o QA Eye newsletter
- o Participation is encouraged





- o Issues for QA Workgroup
 - Red Book Revisions
 - FRM vs. Continuous PM_{2.5} and PM_{10-2.5}
 - Precursor gas work
- How to convey the message
 - QA is an integral part of monitoring
 - Every activity serves a purpose
 - QA activities are justified and not redundant
 - QA resources remain proportional to monitoring costs

